

10/671,229

REMARKS

Claims 14-39, 48, and 49 are pending in the application. Applicant expresses appreciation for the allowance of claims 17-19, 29-39, and 49.

Claims 14-16, 20-28, and 48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki (US Publication No. 2003/0010980) in combination with Joret (U.S. Patent No. 6,924,037). Applicant requests reconsideration.

Claim 14 sets forth an electronic apparatus fabrication method that includes, among other features, forming an insulative glass substrate containing aluminum oxycarbide and forming a layer containing a semiconductive material over the substrate. Page 2 of the Office Action acknowledges that Yamazaki fails to teach the claimed insulative glass substrate containing aluminum oxycarbide and relies upon Joret as allegedly disclosing the missing subject matter. Applicant traverses.

Page 2 of the Office Action alleges that Joret discloses a glass substrate containing aluminum oxycarbide. However, review of column 2, lines 5-20 and column 8, lines 1-10 fails to reveal evidence of such disclosure. Instead, the relied upon text merely describes a three-layer stack of which one layer may contain aluminum oxycarbide. The stack forms a type-B antireflection coating which may be applied over glass. A variety of combinations of type-A and/or type-B antireflection coatings with glass are described in column 6, lines 44-55 of Joret.

Regardless of the use of aluminum oxycarbide in a three-layer stack applied over glass, it is clear from review of Joret as a whole that such

10/671,229

reference fails to disclose or suggest including aluminum oxycarbide in the glass itself. The Joret disclosure may be contrasted with claim 14 which sets forth "an insulative glass substrate comprising aluminum oxycarbide." The mere teaching in Joret of an antireflection coating containing aluminum oxycarbide applied over glass does not amount to a suggestion that the Yamazaki glass substrate contain aluminum oxycarbide. A clear distinction is made in Joret regarding the composition of the antireflection coatings and the glass over which the coatings are formed. No evidence can be identified that Joret discloses including aluminum oxycarbide within a glass composition.

At least for such reasons, no motivation exists to modify the composition of the Yamazaki glass substrate by incorporating the aluminum oxycarbide of the Joret antireflection coating. Accordingly, the cited combination fails to disclose or suggest every limitation of claim 14. Claims 15, 16, 20-28, and 48 depend from claim 14 and are patentable at least for such reason as well as for the additional limitations of such claims not disclosed or suggested.

For example, claims 23-27 set forth that forming the semiconductive material includes removing a layer of silicon from a monocrystalline silicon wafer and bonding the silicon layer to the insulative glass substrate containing aluminum oxycarbide. Page 3 of the Office Action alleges that it is well-known to form the semiconductive material layer in such manner. However, the Office Action fails to provide substantial evidence that it is well-known to bond such a silicon layer to an insulative glass substrate containing

10/671,229

aluminum oxycarbide. At least for such reason, the Office Action's rejection of claims 23-27 lacks a basis founded in substantial evidence.

Applicant herein establishes adequate reasons supporting patentability of claims 14-39, 48, and 49 and requests allowance of all pending claims in the next Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 29 Jun 2006

By: 

James E. Lake
Reg. No. 44,854